DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 924 UD 024 287

TITLE Introduction to High School. High School Renaissance Program. Evaluation Report, Summer 1984 Education Consolidation and Improvement Act Chapter 1.

INSTITUTION Chicago Board of Education, Ill. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.

PUB DATE Apr 85

NOTE 38p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; Attendance Patterns; Basic Skills; Criterion Referenced Tests; Grade 8; High Schools; Mathematics Skills; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Reading Skills; *School Readiness; Student Attitudes; *Student Improvement; *Summer Programs; Underachievement

ABSTRACT

The 1984 "Introduction to High School" program provided seven weeks of academic training for about 600 underachievers in reading and/or mathematics at six Chicago high schools. Evaluation findings indicate that (1) the process of student selection and program implementation during the 1984 program was markedly better that that of the 1983 initial High School Renaissance summer program; (2) the program came close to the target enrollment goal; and (3) attendance continued to be a problem, which hindered the continuity of instruction. The degree of achievement differed from school to school and also differed depending on the academic area tested. Criterion-referenced test results indicated that at any given school the number of students showing improvement ranged from approximately 20% improving in one category to 80% improving in another category. Certain problems encountered indicate that test development and procedures should be planned early for summer 1985. Students appeared to be on task and teachers had adequate instructional materials, although some complained of not receiving them on time. Generally, both the teaching staff and the students surveyed reported that they thought the summer program was helpful and that "learning was taking place." The best indicator of the program's success ultimately will be how well students attend school, achieve academically and become socially oriented to high school. (RDN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257924

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act
Chapter 1

EVALUATION REPORT — SUMMER 1984

High School Renaissance Program

"Introduction to High School"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F. Schuster
Chicago Board of Ed., IL.
Dept. of Research + Evaluation
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

April 1985

CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Manford Byrd, Jr.
General Superintendent of Schools

UD 024287

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act
Chapter 1

Evaluation Report - Summer 1984

High School Renaissance Program

"Introduction to High School"

Chicago Public Schools

Manford Byrd, Jr.
General Superintendent of Schools

Irving M. Brauer
Director of Projects
Department of Research and Evaluation

April 1985

It is the policy of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, religion, age, handicaps unrelated to ability, or sex in its educational program or employment policies or practices.

BOARD OF EDUCATION
CITY OF CHICAGO

Mr. George Munoz, President
Mr. William M. Farrow, Vice-President

Mrs. Betty Bonow
Mr. Clark Burrus
Dr. Frank W. Gardner
Mrs. Rose Mary Janus
Dr. Wilfred Reid
Ms. Myrna E. Salazar
Mr. Raul A. Villalobos

Chicago Public Schools

Manford Byrd, Jr.
General Superintendent of Schools

Irving M. Brauer
Director of Projects
Department of Research and Evaluation

The program evaluated in this report was funded under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act and administered by the Executive Directors, High School Renaissance Program.

The evaluation was conducted by Joseph F. Schroeder, from the Bureau of ECIA Program Evaluation, Department of Research and Evaluation.

Fred Schuster, Director
Bureau of ECIA Program Evaluation

Summer 1984 Evaluation Report

Introduction to High School

High School Renaissance Programs

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	vii
Introduction	1
Evaluation Procedures	2
Implementation	3
General Information	3
Staffing	3
Inservice/Staff Development	4
Student Enrollment and Attendance	4
Instructional Facilities	5
Instructional Techniques	7
Student Opinion	9
Achievement	11
Conclusions	15
Recommendations	17
Appendix	19
Teacher Questionnaire	21
Student Questionnaire	25
Classroom Observation Form	29

Introduction to High School Summer Evaluation Report
High School Renaissance Programs

Executive Summary

The 1984 "Introduction to High School" program provided seven weeks of academic instruction at six high schools. About 600 students (mainly eighth grade graduates who would enter high school in September as freshmen) were selected to participate. These students were underachievers in reading and/or mathematics. The program emphasized the development of critical thinking skills and their application in the areas of reading, mathematics, and oral and written communication. A typical model of the program was 100 students being served by four teachers at each school.

Evaluation findings indicated the following:

- The process of student selection and program implementation during the 1984 summer was a marked improvement over the 1983 initial High School Renaissance summer program.

- The program came close to the target enrollment goal of 100 students at each of the six schools conducting the program. The six high schools had an enrollment range of 83 students to 113 students.

- Attendance continued to be a problem which hinders the continuity of instruction. Attendance during on-site visitations ranged from 72 to 76 percent. The Department of Government Funded Programs staff also reported a 76 percent attendance rate during their monitoring of the program.

The degree of achievement differed from school to school and also differed depending on the academic area tested. Criterion-referenced test results indicate that at any given school the number of students showing improvement ranged from approximately 20 percent improving in one category to 80 percent improving in another category.

- Though some degree of improvement took place it is important to note that some inconsistency due to the number and level of difficulty between pre and post items on the criterion-referenced test was reported by evaluators and Renaissance staff. This indicates that early planning for the summer of 1985 should take place related to test development and procedures.

- During on-site visitations, evaluators noted that the great majority of students were on task, being taught by experienced teachers in adequate facilities. Teachers appeared to have an adequate supply and variety of instructional materials. However, some teachers complained about not receiving materials in a timely manner that they were supposed to use in order to follow the syllabus.

- Generally, both the teaching staff and the students who were surveyed, reported that they thought the summer program was helpful and that "learning was taking place."

A follow-up study on the students who participated in the summer program will take place in the spring of 1985, to determine how well they adjusted to their first year of high school when compared to their peers.

After considering the evaluation findings perhaps the best indicator of success for the "Introduction to High School" summer program will be how well the students attend school, achieve academically and become oriented socially to the high school.

Introduction to High School
Evaluation Summer Report
Fiscal 1984

High School Renaissance Programs

Introduction

The Summer High School Renaissance Program "Introduction to High School" was basically designed to help eighth grade graduates, although underachieving ninth grade students and tenth grade students who wished to reinforce basic academic skills could also attend. The program emphasized the development of critical thinking skills and their application in the areas of reading, mathematics, and oral and written communication.

Included in the program were these goals:

- to begin building the foundation for academic success by introducing the freshman English and mathematics curriculum to incoming freshmen.
- to facilitate a smooth transition from the elementary school to the high school by introducing the student to a high school setting.
- to improve the basic skills of first year high school students in need of additional time on task.

The program operated for seven weeks from July 2 to August 17, 1984 at the following high schools.

Curie	Young
Julian	Clemente
Kenwood	Lane

Hours of operation were from 8:00 a.m. through 12:00 noon, Monday through Friday. A typical model of the program was 100 students at each site being served by four teachers.

Evaluation Procedures

In order to obtain data that would inform the program's directors, administrators and teachers about the program's strengths and weaknesses and provide input for modifying future summer programs, the following evaluation activities took place: 1) staff interviews, 2) classroom observations, 3) teachers and student surveys, 4) inservice observations, 5) audit reports by Department of Government Funded Program staff. Criterion-referenced test results were also analyzed.

The following instruments were developed and/or used by the Department of Research and Evaluation to assess program effectiveness.

- High School Renaissance--Summer Programs: Classroom Observation Form; permits notations to be made regarding instructional activities and materials, students' activities and behavior, and the educational setting.
- High School Renaissance--Summer Program: Teacher Questionnaire; assists in assessing program implementation and effectiveness from the teachers' perspective.
- High School Renaissance--Summer Program: Student Questionnaire; assists in assessing program operations and obtaining facts from the students' perspective.
- Pre and post criterion-referenced tests in reading and mathematics; developed by Renaissance and curriculum staff to provide an assessment of student achievement in reading and mathematics.
- ECIA Chapter 1 Inservice Meeting Form; provides notation of the inservice meetings conducted for summer staff.
- ECIA Chapter 1 and 2 Monitoring Report (provided by the Department of Government Funded Programs); assists in determining program eligibility and management, enrollment, and attendance data.

Information acquired through the procedures specified and instruments described permits the following evaluation questions to be addressed:

1) Were there implementation problems in the summer program?
2) Were the instructional strategies and plans followed?
3) Were teachers able to follow a prescribed schedule of activities?
4) What, if any, were the problems related to student selection? Staff selection?
5) Did the students achieve during the summer?
6) What materials were used to instruct students?
7) How did all concerned with the summer program view their participation?
8) To which degree did the summer program achieve desired results?

Implementation

General Information

Based on the experience of conducting a summer high school program in 1983, the High School Renaissance Summer Program began in 1984 with fewer problems. In addition to a smoother implementation, the program was expanded from three schools in 1983 to six schools in 1984. The proposed membership for the six schools was 600 students.

Department of Government Funded Program monitoring staff reported the following by the end of July, 1984: A total of 24 classrooms were monitored for staffing, membership, attendance and eligibility. By the end of July the Renaissance summer program obtained a membership of 574 or 96 percent of their goal. The average classroom attendance observed was 24 students. This number reflected a 76 percent attendance rate.

Also during July and August, staff from the Department of Research and Evaluation visited the six high schools conducting the program. Evaluators visited each of the 24 classrooms an average of two times between the second and sixth week of the seven-week program. The average enrollments in the classrooms during the visitations were close to what the monitors described for July. The average membership per room was 26 ; the average number of students in attendance was 20, which was also a 76 percent attendance rate.

Teachers indicated that records of students referred for participation were more complete and available than reported the previous summer by program staff. Planning in early spring by Renaissance staff to avoid this problem enhanced decreasing the time expended to recruit participants.

Staffing

Staffing posed no problems. As in 1983, hundreds of qualified teachers applied for the four teaching positions at each of the six high schools. Teachers conducting the High School Renaissance Summer Program were teachers of English, reading and mathematics. Preference for hiring the teachers according to renaissance staff was given to those teachers experienced with remedial programs, especially the renaissance learning centers.

Data obtained from on-site visitations, interviews and questionnaires indicated that the teachers participating in the "Introduction to High School" program were experienced in the subject areas they were teaching. During classroom visitations teachers were observed to be using whole class, small group and in some cases individualized instructional techniques.

Inservice/Staff Development

In addition to pre-program inservice provided by vendors of instructional materials used in the summer program, teachers attended periodic inservice training sessions at their school sites. These meetings ranged from once a week to twice a month at some schools. Presenters of the staff development sessions included staff from curriculum and guidance bureaus, renaissance staff and teachers participating in the summer program. Each of the six schools this summer had a Renaissance program manager stationed at the school most of the instructional day. This program manager assisted teachers individually and during group meetings as the need arose. Coordinating the summer program at each individual school was basically the responsibility of the program manager. This was an improvement over the previous summer when a classroom teacher also had the responsibility of coordinating the summer program.

Student Enrollment and Attendance

Improved enrollment procedures based somewhat on the experience of the 1983 summer program resulted in fewer and less serious implementation problems during the 1984 summer.

Principals of sending schools were provided with instructions and enrollment forms in early spring to recommend participants for the summer program. This gave school administrators time to select eligible students and properly identify those students for summer participation. Few if any students were found to be ineligible to participate during the summer of 1984. This facilitated a smoother implementation for teachers who were provided with information on each student at the beginning of the program.

Attendance in 1984 continued to be a problem as it was in the summer of 1983. The average attendance rate of eligible eighth grade graduates in 1983 was 75 percent. In the summer of 1984 the attendance rate was noted as 76 percent by Department of Government Funded Program monitors during July, and by Research and Evaluation staff during August.

During the 1983 summer, the most common explanation by both teachers and students for the high absenteeism was the extremely warm weather. The 1984 summer was much cooler, but this did not increase the attendance rate. Teachers during the 1984 summer said that one change that may increase attendance, if utilized in the future, would be starting the program later in the morning. Eighth grade graduates have been used to beginning school at 9:00 at their elementary schools. Summer students began at 8:00 and most lived beyond walking distance from school. An important consideration to note is that Reading and Math Learning Center teachers who conduct the regular school year High School Renaissance Program have complained about the same problems. They have the biggest difficulty with absenteeism during the first and last periods of the day. Most of their participants are ninth grade students.

Instructional Facilities

Regular size or larger rooms usually found in a high school were used for instruction. These facilities were reported to be at least adequate by evaluation staff. Lighting, ventilation and size were rated as adequate except for two rooms. The comfort level of the temperature in the classrooms used for instruction was better than reported in the summer of 1983 which was, as previously mentioned, an unusually warm summer.

Instructional Techniques

During July and August a total of 47 classroom observations took place across the six high schools. Generally the classroom climate was rated as conducive to learning. Teachers' comments to students on their work performance was noted as positive for the majority of observations. The great majority of students observed were on task, usually in an instructional setting that was in direct contact with the teachers, such as discussion, explanation or demonstration. The second most observed instructional activity was the student applying what was learned in a practice or independent seatwork exercise.

Some students were receiving individualized instruction. However, the majority of students were receiving whole class instruction during observation.

The type of lessons observed most frequently during reading lessons were identifying and summarizing main ideas, applying critical thinking skills and distinguishing fact from myth and opinions.

Students were observed to be writing "creatively" in about 15 percent of the observations. Teachers were observed to be working with students closely to encourage them to think critically and apply skills learned in their work.

Materials observed in use for the reading and English classes were Foundation for Learning, Introducing Thinking Skills and a variety of additional materials either teacher supplied or vendor produced such as Innovative Science, Academic Book Level 15. Seven teachers reported not receiving all of the materials that Renaissance staff instructed them to use. Some teachers indicated that much time was wasted copying materials so that all of the students would have the lessons that were to be completed in workbooks that never arrived or arrived late.

Observation of mathematics classes indicated that the majority of students were on task and receiving whole-class instruction. In some cases individualized or small-group instruction was observed. Students were observed to be receiving instruction in ratios and proportions, fractions, decimals and percent. During five observations the students were receiving instruction in algebra. Materials observed in use were the Computational Skill Development Kit, student booklets, Mastery Learning Systems and teacher made worksheets.

Generally, teachers were on target in keeping up with the proposed syllabus for instruction. A few teachers indicated that they modified their plans according to the strengths and/or weaknesses of the students assigned to them.

The consensus of observers regarding the on-site visitations was that most teachers seemed highly energetic and enthusiastic about their teaching tasks. The majority of teachers surveyed indicated that they thought that most of the students were learning and the summer program would help them in high school.

Student Opinion

A total of 327 students, over 60 percent, of the summer enrollment were surveyed to determine their opinions of the summer program. Some 70 percent of these students were informed by school staff such as principals, teachers or counselors about the summer program. The remaining students reported finding out about the program through school bulletins, friends or school advertisements. The majority of the students began the summer program between July 2 and July 15. Less than 10 percent began later than this period. When asked why they chose to participate, 21 percent of the students indicated that they thought the program would be interesting. Thirty percent thought it would help them academically as a review of either math, reading or test-taking skills.

Compared to last summer only a few students (9 percent) claimed to be influenced by their parents. During the summer of 1983, about 25 percent of the students, listed parents as a reason they entered the summer program. Included in other reasons for attending were "meeting people" (8 percent) and "no summer plans" (11 percent).

Ninety percent of the students indicated they took a pretest when beginning the program. Eighty-eight percent reported having quizzes either weekly or every two weeks. Except for a few, the majority of students indicated that they enjoyed the summer program. Fifty-four percent stated that they enjoyed the program, "a great deal." Another 39 percent noted that they enjoyed the program, "somewhat."

Twenty-four percent of the students reported learning more about reading this summer, 43 percent thought they learned more about mathematics, another 31 percent indicated English as the subject they learned more about.

The majority of students thought that attending the summer program would help them during their first semester in high school.

Achievement

Renaissance program staff and curriculum staff devised criterion-referenced tests in reading, writing, and mathematics to assess student achievement during the summer program.

Results from a pretest and a posttest were obtained for about 500 students. It is important to note that there was some inconsistency between pretest results and posttest results due to the type of items and numbers of items selected by Renaissance staff. Also, depending on the test, from 10 to 28 percent of the students were not included in the results for a variety of reasons, (absence, identification errors, etc.).

Table 1 on the next page shows achievement results for summer students in the six high schools conducting the program. The number of students who took the pre and posttest and the percent of students demonstrating improvement are indicated. Test results for reading, writing, mathematics and critical thinking skills are included. In addition, the mean attendance rates are shown.

Whether or not students achieved may be better determined by their progress in high school reading and mathematics and their results on the TAP test during the fall of 1984.

Teachers reported that they thought the majority of students progressed during the 1984 summer. Perhaps the best indication of success will be student performance during their first year in high school.

Seventy-eight percent of the students said they completed their summer assignments either "always" or "almost always". Twenty percent said "sometimes" to the question. Almost 80 percent of the students reported that the teacher helped them when they needed assistance. Nineteen percent reported that teachers helped them "sometimes."

As for understanding their assignments, 71 percent of the students indicated understanding "always" or "almost always." Twenty-nine percent of the students understood their assignments "sometimes".

Generally, student remarks were favorable toward the teachers and the program.

Table 1

Criterion Referenced Test Results and Attendance Rates for Students in the Six High Schools Conducting the "Introduction to High School Programs"

School	Reading	Writing	Ratios	Fractions	Decimals	Percents	Metrics	Clear Thinking
LANE								
STUDENTS ENROLLED (N) = 80								
ATTENDANCE RATE 74.2%								
N PRETESTED	56	73	55	55	55	54	54	68
N POSTTESTED	74	71	71	70	71	71	69	70
N PRE-POST	51	65	49	48	49	48	47	59
N IMPROVING	25	48	33	22	30	10	19	29
% IMPROVING	49.0	73.8	67.3	45.8	61.2	20.8	40.4	49.2
KENWOOD								
STUDENTS ENROLLED (N) = 113								
ATTENDANCE RATE 77.1%								
N PRETESTED	108	109	98	98	98	98	97	107
N POSTTESTED	82	75	74	73	74	72	37	72
N PRE-POST	82	73	70	69	70	68	34	72
N IMPROVING	30	39	41	35	43	18	8	43
% IMPROVING	36.6	53.4	58.6	50.7	61.4	26.5	23.5	59.7
YOUNG								
STUDENTS ENROLLED (N) = 87								
ATTENDANCE RATE 71.7%								
N PRETESTED	81	102	89	89	89	88	77	
N POSTTESTED	85	84	76	75	75	72	85	
N PRE-POST	67	84	67	66	6[illegible]	62	64	
N IMPROVING	48	65	57	13	[illegible]	17	37	
% IMPROVING	71.6	77.4	85.1	19.7	27.[illegible]	27.4	57.8	

Table 1 (cont'd)

School	Reading	Writing	Ratios	Fractions	Decimals	Percents	Metrics	Clear Thinking
CURIE								
STUDENTS ENROLLED (N) = 94								
ATTENDANCE RATE 77.1								
N PRETESTED	83	86	82	82	77	82	77	100
N POSTTESTED	78	83	85	85	85	85	62	83
N PRE-POST	76	77	71	71	66	71	56	83
N IMPROVING	24	16	61	36	24	16	22	53
% IMPROVING	31.6	20.8	85.9	50.7	36.4	22.5	39.3	63.9
JULIAN								
STUDENTS ENROLLED 88								
ATTENDANCE RATE 64.3%								
N PRETESTED	75	85	77	77	77	76	*72	55
N POSTTESTED	67	70	59	60	60	59	0	13
N PRE-POST	62	64	54	54	54	54	0	12
N IMPROVING	41	56	44	26	29	12	M	7
% IMPROVING	66.1	87.5	81.5	48.1	53.7	22.2	M	58.3
CLEMENTE								
STUDENTS ENROLLED (N) = 75								
ATTENDANCE RATE 67.2%								
N PRETESTED	60	76	42	42	42	42	*41	43
N POSTTESTED	52	45	38	38	38	38	0	55
N PRE-POST	37	42	33	33	33	33	0	29
N IMPROVING	19	28	28	20	19	23	M	25
% IMPROVING	51.4	66.7	84.8	60.6	57.6	69.7	M	86.2

* No data available

Conclusions

The process of student selection and program implementation during the summer of 1984 was a marked improvement over the 1983 initial summer program.

The range of enrolled students in the six summer high schools was a low of 83 to high of 113. This is close to the target goal of 100 students participating at each school.

Though teachers reported students progressed and some degree of achievement was noted in criterion-referenced test results, some inconsistency was noted when comparing the pre- and posttests due to a difference in the number of items and level of difficulty. Attendance was still a problem for most teachers this summer. Attendance ranged from 72 to 76 percent during on-site visitations which is low for continuity of instruction. This was also a problem during the previous summer.

Although observations indicated that teachers had materials to instruct as suggested by the program outline, many teachers complained about the late arrival of instructional material.

Generally, teachers provided favorable reactions toward the program and students. Facilities utilized were at least adequate for instruction.

Recommendations

Continue the summer high school orientation program in the future for eighth grade graduates.

Prepare tests for the students well in advance of the next summer program. Efforts should be made to develop and correlate items on the pre- and posttest.

A comparison study on 1984 summer students toward the end of their first year of high school should be completed to better determine how well the orientation program assisted them toward academic success.

Prepare for the 1985 summer program in the early spring to allow for continued ease of implementation, as was noted during the 1984 summer.

Teachers should receive the required instructional material on the first day of the summer program.

APPENDIX

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
BUREAU OF ECIA PROGRAM EVALUATION

High School Renaissance 1984 Summer Program
Teacher Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to assist the Department of Research and Evaluation in determining the effectiveness of the program in which you were employed for the summer. By freely expressing your feelings and concerns in relation to the topics included in the questionnaire, feedback about this program will be provided for the educational planners. Respond only to those items which apply to your program. Thank you for your cooperation in this survey. Please return the completed questionnaire to the program evaluator.

Attendance Information

1. Record the following information for the students in your homeroom.

   Membership at the beginning of the summer program, July 2
   Membership as of July 15th
   Membership as of August 15th (estimate)

2. Record the actual number of students who regularly attended your classes.

Periods	1	2	3	4
	___	___	___	___

Instructional Program

3. What subject area are you teaching in this summer program?

   ____ Reading
   ____ English
   ____ Social Studies
   ____ Mathematics
   ____ Science
   ____ Guidance
   ____ Other (explain) _____

   _____

4. Considering your instructional objectives, which of the following skills were most emphasized in your classes? (Check all that apply.)

   ____ critical thinking
   ____ listening
   ____ problem solving
   ____ computation
   ____ speaking
   ____ spelling
   ____ reading
   ____ writing
   ____ vocabulary development
   ____ test taking skills
   ____ stress management
   ____ study skills
   ____ image building
   ____ time management
   ____ other: (explain) _____

   _____

5. Which of the following instructional activities did you use most frequently to assist you with achieving the program objectives?

_____ lectures
_____ discussions
_____ oral recitation
_____ demonstrations
_____ tutoring
_____ experiments
_____ A-V presentations
_____ other (explain) _____

6. Which of the following instructional materials did you use most frequently to assist you with achieving the program objectives?

_____ textbook
_____ supplementary book(s)
_____ periodical
_____ newspaper
_____ science equipment
_____ learning kit
_____ workbook
_____ worksheet (commercial)
_____ worksheet (teacher made)
_____ other (explain) _____

7. How would you rate the general conditions of your classroom this summer for learning?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
a. lighting	1	2	3	4
b. ventilation	1	2	3	4
c. temperature	1	2	3	4
d. windows	1	2	3	4
e. walls	1	2	3	4
f. furniture	1	2	3	4
g. adequacy of space	1	2	3	4
h. other (explain) _____	1	2	3	4

8. Which of the following techniques did you use to determine students' mastery of program objectives?

_____ criterion-referenced tests
_____ performance on unit test scores
_____ Standardized Achievement test scores
_____ participation in class discussions
_____ in-class or homework assignments
_____ oral recitations
_____ teacher made tests
_____ project presentations
_____ other (explain) _____

9. Based on the measuring techniques you indicated in item #8, record the actual number of students who achieved 80% mastery of all objectives in your class

_____

10. Please list the number of inservice meetings you attended presented by each of the following:

_____ High School Renaissance staff
_____ Bureau of Guidance
_____ District Coordinator
_____ Principal
_____ Site Coordinator
_____ Other

11a. Generally, how would you rate the inservice meetings that you attended for this program?

_____ Excellent _____ Good _____ Fair _____ Poor

11b. Please comment: _____

_____

_____

12. What suggetions for improvement of the inservice meetings can you make for next year's program?

_____ I have no suggestions to offer
_____ I wish to offer the following suggestions:

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. What do you feel were the strengths of this program? _____

_____

_____

_____

14. What do you feel were the weaknesses of the program? _____

_____

_____

_____

Department of Research and Evaluation

Bureau of ECIA Program Evaluation

1984 High School Renaissance Summer Program

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Student Name: _____ I.D. _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

Summer School: _____ Date: _____

Year in School: 8th Grade Grad _____ 9th Grade _____ Other _____

DIRECTIONS:

As a student in the high school summer program your opinion is valuable and appreciated. Please read the following items carefully and answer each one as accurately as you can. The information you provide will be useful to those who develop educational programs for students.

1. How did you find out about the summer school program? (Please check)

_____ Principal	_____ School Friend
_____ Counselor	_____ School Bulletin
_____ Division Teacher	_____ School Advertisement
_____ English Teacher	_____ Other _____

	Yes	No
2. Did you begin the summer program on the first day of summer school? (Please check)		
July 2 through 15	_____	
July 16 through 31	_____	
August or after	_____	

3. Why did you register for this program? (check as many as apply)

a. _____ My parent(s) expected me to.
b. _____ I thought it would be interesting.
c. _____ I didn't have anything planned for the summer.
d. _____ I needed the English review class
e. _____ I needed the Math review class.
f. _____ To improve my Science/Social Studies skills.
g. _____ To improve my test-taking skills
h. _____ I thought it would be a good way to meet new people
i. _____ Other: _____
j. _____ Other: _____

	Yes	No
4. Were you given a test when you started the program? (Please check)	_____	_____

5. Have you had to take any quizzes or tests during the summer program? (please check)

Daily ___ Weekly ___ Every two weeks ___ Each month ___ Never ___

6. Do you enjoy being in the summer program?

A great deal _____ Somewhat _____ Not at all _____

7. Place a check after each subject you feel you have learned more about this summer.

Reading ___ Math ___ Social Studies ___ English ___ Science ___

	Yes	No	Not sure
8. Do you feel what you have learned this summer will help you do better in school this fall?	_____	_____	_____
9. If given the chance would you attend school next summer for this program?	_____	_____	_____

10. Did you attend classes?

Always ___ Almost always ___ Sometimes ___ Never ___

11. Did you feel you understood your assignments this summer? (Please check)

Always ___ Almost always ___ Sometimes ___ Never ___

12. Did you complete your assignments? (Please check)

Always ___ Almost always ___ Sometimes ___ Never ___

13. Did your teacher usually help you when you needed help with your assignments?

Always ___ Almost always ___ Sometimes ___ Never ___

14. Briefly write what you liked the most about the summer program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

15. What didn't you like about the summer program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
Bureau of ECIA Program Evaluation

1984 SUMMER PROGRAM CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FORM

Program site: _____ District __ __ Unit __ __ __ __

Observer: _____ Teacher: _____

Date of observation: July __ __ August __ __ Room __ __ __

Program site classification ..... ___

1 = ECIA Basic Skills Center
2 = OEEO Basic Skills Center
3 = High School Renaissance Program

Week of summer session..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Day of week.....1 2 3 4 5

Hour of day ..... ___

1 = Between 8:30 and 9:30
2 = Between 9:30 and 10:30
3 = Between 10:30 and 12:00

Organizational grade level(s) of students in this classroom..... __

Code 1 to 8 for elementary grade levels
Code 9 for any high school level ___

Number of students currently enrolled in this classroom..... __ __
Highest number of students present during this observation ..... __ __

Number of tutors currently assigned to this classroom ..... __ __
Highest number of tutors present during this observation ..... __ __

Comment on exceptional situations: _____

_____

_____

_____

PREDOMINANT LEARNING CLIMATE

1 = Insufficient evidence for assessment
2 = Not conducive to learning
3 = Conducive to learning
4 = Highly conducive to learning

Degree of temperature and ventilation furing this observation ..... ____
Amount of space for movement..... ____
Spatial arrangements created by the teacher..... ____
Function/quality of displays..... ____
Tutors' management of tutors and students..... ____
Teacher's management of tutors and students..... ____
Teacher's comments to students on their work/performance..... ____

Comment on exemplary learning climate: _____

_____

_____

_____

READING/COMMUNICATION LESSON CONTENT OBSERVED*

Directions: To determine codes 1 and 2 consult Basic Skills Program Handbook, page 5. To determine codes 3 and 4 consult pages 8-10.

3 = Agrees with curricular topic prescribed for this week.....
4 = Does not agree with curricular topic prescribed for this week.....

1 = Agrees with type of lesson prescribed for this period.....
2 = Does not agree with type of lesson prescribed for this period..

Check lesson type: ____ Developmental ____ Tutored

Alphabet recognition/sequencing	___ ___
Isolated work-attack/phonic skills.....	___ ___
Vocabulary learning strategirs.....	___ ___
Comprehension skills.....	___ ___
identifying/reporting literal details.....	___ ___
identifying/reporting inferential meanings.....	___ ___
appreciating mood/characterization/figures of speech..	___ ___
identifying/summarizing main ideas.....	___ ___
distinguishing fact/myth opinion	___ ___
applying other critical thinking skills.....	___ ___
Oral reading to assess skills/develop interpretation.....	___ ___
Recreational reading/SQUIRT.....	___ ___
_____	
Orientation to high school.....	___ ___

SCIENCE LESSON CONTENT OBSERVED*

Directions: Code as in the preceding section. Consult page 25.

Presentation of basic concepts.....	___ ___
Demonstration/experimentation.....	___ ___
Application of problem-solving/thinking skills.....	___ ___
Enrichment/enjoyment/recreation.....	___ ___
_____	___ ___

*Write comments on discrepancies on page 6. Multiple codes permitted

MATHEMATICS LESSON CONTENT OBSERVED*

Directions: To determine codes 1 and 2 consult Basic Skills Program Handbook, page 5. To determine codes 3 and 4 consult pages 13-24.

3 = Agrees with curricular topic prescribed for this week.....
4 = Does not agree with curricular topic prescribed for this week.....

1 = Agrees with type of lesson prescribed for this period.....
2 = Does not agree with type of lesson prescribed for this period..

Check lesson type: _____ Developmental _____ Tutored

Numerals/counting.....	___	___
Comparative size/ratio/proportion.....	___	___
Geometric shapes/forms	___	___
Addition or subtraction		
whole numbers.....	___	___
decimals.....	___	___
fractions.....	___	___
Multiplication or division		
whole numbers	___	___
decimals.....	___	___
fractions.....	___	___
Measurement		
time/distance.....	___	___
perimeter/area/volume.....	___	___
metric system.....	___	___
Problem solving strategies.....	___	___
Percentage/finacial accounting.....	___	___
Graphs/charts/tables.....	___	___
Alegebra.....	___	___
Enrichment/enjoyment/recreation.....	___	___
_____	___	___

*Write comments on discrepancies on page 6. Multiple codes permitted.

INSTRUCTION MATERIALS OBSERVED IN USE

1 = Prescribed for use at the observed grade level
2 = Not prescribed for use at the observed grade level

Reading Materials	Prescribed for grades:	Code
Brigance Comprehensive Inventory Student Test Book.....	All grades	___
Brigance Comprehensive Inventory Student Record Book	All grades	___
Vocabulary Learning Strategies (Mastery Education)	All grades	___
The Satellite Books (Holt).....	1 2 3 4 5 6	___
Multiple Skills Series (Barnell Loft).....	1 2	___
Making Inferences (Hammond)	1 2 3	___
Reading Skills for the Social studies (Hammond).....	4 5 6	___
High Action Reading (Modern Curriculum Press).....	2 7 8	___
Increasing Comprehension (Modern Curriculum Press)	3 4 5 6	___
Readability Series (Harper and Row).....	7 8	___
Paperback REading library (Paperback Sales).....	7 8	___
CMLR Worktext (Mastery Eduction).....	8	___
		___
_____		___

Science Materials		
Science on a Shoestring (Learning Spectrum).....	1 2 3 4 5 6	___
Microscope Program (Learning Spectrum).....	7	___
Blood Program (Health Services).....	7	___
pH Measurement Kit (Lab-Aids).....	8	___
Molecular Model (Kit (Lab-Aids).....	8	___
Science Library (Children's Press).....		___
_____		___

Mathematics Materials		
Versa-Tiles (Educational Teaching Aids).....	All grades	___
Problem-Solving Math (Modern Curriculum Press.....	All grades	___
Blackline Masters teacher's Resource Package (Holt)	All grades	___
Mathematics Games (Beckley CArdy/Educational Teaching Aids).	All grades	___
Personal Discovery Kit (Barnett Learning Dynamics).....	1 2 3	___
Mini-Tests: ER, IR, I (Educational Solutions.....	5 6	___
Small Change Unit (Citicorp,.....	7 8	___
Enright Inventory of Mathematics Resource Book.....	5 6 7 8	___
Enright Student Tests and Record Book.....	5 6 7 8	___

*Write comments on discrepencies on page 6.

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

Directions: See the back of this section and the "Glossary" sheet.

Type of Activity Conducting/Monitoring Observing/Participating in:	End of first 10 minutes ON	End of first 10 minutes OFF	End of last 10 minutes
Explanation/demonstration/ guided discussion:			
teacher.....			
tutors.....			
students.....			
Routine recitation/rote reinforcement:			
teacher.....			
tutors			
students.....			
Application/practice/ independent seatwork			
teacher.....			
tutors			
student.....			
Formal assessment/testing:			
teacher.....			
tutors			
students.....			
Enjoyment/recreation:			
teacher.....			
tutors			
students.....			
Waiting			
teacher.....			
tutors			
students.....			
Transition/clerical tasks:			
teacher.....			
tutors.....			
students.....			

COMMENTS ON OBSERVED LESSON CONTENT AND MATERIALS IN USE

In the space below, please explain discrepancies between the observed and prescribed lesson content and/or materials in use.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HOW TO CODE "DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES"

Code two times during this observation as indicated by the grid headings. Enter your counts of students, tutors, and teacher(s) whose participation in each observed type of activity apparently fits these descriptions: ON TASK or OFF TASK. See the definitions given below.

The count for each observation cycle must be an unduplicated count. Individuals who are present for the day but not in the classroom during a particular observation cycle should be counted as participants in "Transition/clerical tasks."

"Waiting" means that instruction or learning is being delayed until materials are in hand, until directions for proceeding are given, until a request for assistance can be heeded, until some interruption has ended, or the like.

It is important to understand that each type of activity represents a situation in which the teacher, one or more tutors, and/orone more students may play a role. Typical roles (some of which might be interchanged in the course of a well-conducted lesson) are: instructor, supervisor, monitor, tutor, tutee, learner, performer, observer.

In the space for comments on this page, describe exemplary situations and/or activities tht do not fit any of the types listed on the form.

Definitions

ON TASK: Predominantly performing or behaving as fulfillment of the activity requires or as the person in charge has directed.

OFF TASK: Predominantly not performing or behaving as fulfillment of the activity requires or as the person in charge has directed.

Comments

BEST COPY AVAILABLE